DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 579 FL 002 652

AUTHOR Cohen, Karen M.; Kimmerling, Flo Gryn
TITLE Attitudes Based on English Dialect Differences: An Analysis of Current Research.
INSTITUTION Language Research Foundation, Cambridge, Mass.
PUB DATE Jul 71
NOTE 54p.; In Language Research Report No. 4

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *American English; Communication (Thought Transfer); Cultural Differences; *Dialects; Discriminatory Attitudes (Social); Ethnic Grouping; Language; *Literature Reviews; Minority Groups; Negro Dialects; Nonstandard Dialects; Personality; Social Dialects; Social Differences; *Sociolinguistics; Speech; Tables (Data); *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This paper organizes and evaluates 18 studies dealing with attitudes based on language differences which people possess toward others. Special consideration is given to the area of teacher-student relationships. The authors present a synopsis of each of the 18 studies, considering such details as purpose, speakers, judges, stimulus materials, measure, factors of speech studied, and findings. A summary of selected statistical data is presented, followed by a discussion of the general results of the studies, considering ethnic and dialect identification, speech quality, social and personal factors, and teacher-student relationships. The final sections of the paper include an evaluation and critique of the study and a discussion of conclusions and implications. (VM)

ED056579

From: Language Research Report No. 4, July 1971.

Attitudes Based on English Dialect Differences: An Analysis of Current Research

by

Karen M. Cohen and Flo Gryn Kimmerling

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Karen M. Cohen, Flo Gryn Kimmerling TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

INTRODUCTION[1]

People frequently identify ethnicity, determine socioeconomic status (SES), and assign a variety of values to other people on the basis of subtle linguistic cues. This paper is an attempt to organize systematically and to evaluate critically the available studies dealing with attitudes people possess toward others based on language differences, the teacher-student relationship being a specific example found in the literature. The following discussion is intended to:

i) isolate the variables that seem to be identifiable based on a variety of speech samples (ethnicity and SES);

ii) explore the social and personal factors usually associated with identification of such variables;

iii) alert teachers to judgments frequently made about children;

iv) filter out the bases for judgments relating to ethnicity, SES, personal traits, and teacher-student communication;

v) examine additional information that might be

FL002 652

beneficial in evaluating communication between individuals.

The paper has the following organization:

Section 1: A bibliography of studies analyzed in this paper.

Section 2: Synopsis of each research study.

Hereafter the evaluation is divided into two main parts (except for Section 5). The studies dealing primarily with student-teacher interaction are grouped together (studies include 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18) whereas those dealing primarily with socioeconomic status, ethnic identification, and related social and personal characteristics are reviewed together (studies 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 13-18).

Section 3: Tables which summarize selected parameters mentioned in the synopses. (A=student-teacher studies; B= studies involving SES, ethnicity, and general characteristics.)

Section 4: General Results from the studies. (Part I=studies concerned with ethnicity, SES, and general characteristics; Part II=student-teacher studies.)

Section 5: Evaluation/Critique of Studies.

Section 6: Conclusions and Implications (A=student-teacher studies; B=studies dealing with SES, ethnicity, and general characteristics.)

1. The authors wish to thank Dr. Bruce Fraser for his assistance and guidance and Drs. C. Cazden, R. Naremore, R. Shuy, G.R. Tucker, and F. Williams for making available many of the studies included in this report.

Section 1

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

1. Anisfeld, M., N. Bogo, and W.E. Lambert, "Evaluational Reactions to Accented English Speech," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 65:223-231 (1962).

2. Bryden, J.D., On Acoustic and Social Dialect Analysis of Perceptual Variables in Listener Identification and Rating of Negro Speakers, Final Report, Bureau of Research, Office of Education, HEW Project No. 7-C-003 (1968).

3. Buck, J., "The Effects of Negro and White Dialectal Variations upon the Attitudes of College Students," Speech Monograph 35:181-187 (1968).

4.-ABC Ellis, D.S., "Speech and Social Status in America," Social Forces 45:431-437 (1967).

5. Felsenthal, N., "Racial Identification as a Variable in Mediated Instruction," paper presented at AERA (March 1970).

6. Fleming, J.T., "Teachers' Ratings of Urban Children's Reading Performance," paper presented at AERA (March 1970).

7. Gess, L., The Effects of Information which is Provided to Teachers Concerning Students on the Attitudes and the Behaviors of the Teachers and the Students, unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan (1969).

8. Guskin, J., "Social Perception of Language Variations: Black Dialect and Expectations of Abilities," paper presented at AERA (March 1970).

9.Harms, L.S., "Listener Judgments of Status Cues in Speech," Quarterly Journal of Speech 47:164-168 (1961).

10. Harms, L.S., "Status Cues in Speech: Extra-race and Extra-region Identification," Lingua 12:300-306 (1963).

11. Holmes, M.B., Interaction Patterns as a Source of Error in Teachers' Evaluations of Head Start Children, Final Report, OEO (August 1968).

12. Hughes, A.E., An Investigation of Certain Sociolinguistic Phenomena in the Vocabulary, Pronunciation, and Grammar of Disadvantaged Pre-school Children, Their Parents, and Their Teachers in the Detroit Public Schools, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University (1967).

13. Lambert, W.E. and G.R. Tucker, "White and Negro Listeners' Reactions to Various American-English Dialects," Social Forces 47.4:463-468 (1969).

14. Naremore, R.C., "Teachers' Judgments of Children's Speech: A Factor Analytic Study of Attitudes," Speech Monographs (in press, 1970).

15. Putnam, G.N. and E. O'Hern, "The Status Significance of an Isolated Urban Dialect," Language Dissertation No. 53, Language 31.4, Part 2 (1955).

16. Shamo, W., "Psychological Correlates of Speech Characteristics of Sounding Disadvantages: A Southern Replication," paper presented at AERA (March 1970).

17. Shuy, R., "Subjective Judgments in Sociolinguistic Analysis," Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics, Center for Applied Linguistics (1969).

18. Williams, F., "Psychological Correlates of Speech Characteristics: On Sounding 'Disadvantaged'," Journal of Speech and Hearing Research 13:472-488 (1970).

Section 2

SYNOPSES

Each Synopsis is organized in the following manner:

AUTHOR, title of study

A. Purpose: The purpose of each study as defined by the author(s) is stated.

B. Speakers: This includes background information on speakers such as age, sex, SES, and ethnicity.

C. Judges: Relevant background information on the judges is included.

D. Stimulus (Stim.) Materials: This usually refers to the type of speech sample listeners heard and subsequently judged.

E. Measure: The various measures judges used in their evaluations are mentioned. Also specified are the additional measures the author employed for background information (e.g., SES index).

F. Factors of Speech Studied: Here is indicated whether the analysis of the speech sample was only on the global level or whether specific speech factors were also examined as a possible basis for listener judgments.

G. Findings: The major results of the study, as specified by the author and relevant to this paper, are listed here.

1. ANISFELD, BOGO, LAMBERT: "Evaluational Reactions to Accented English Speech."

A. Purpose: To explore possible differential reactions to Jewish-accented or non-accented speech and differential reactions among judges corresponding to their religious affiliation (Jewish/Gentile).

B. Speakers: All were Jewish adults. Sex and SES of speakers were not mentioned.

C. Judges: 114 Gentile and 64 Jewish college students at McGill.

D. Stim. Materials: A standard reading passage was used for all speech samples.

E. **Measure: perceived religious affiliation of speaker, rated (judge's) own voice, and completed attitude questionnaire (F-scale, anomie scale, and anti-semiticism scale).**

F. Factors of Speech studied: (global only) flawless accented (Jewish) or unaccented English.

G. Findings:

a. The most prominent finding was the devaluation by the judges of Jewish-accented guises on height, good looks, and leadership for any speaker (whether speaker was identified as Jewish or not).

b. Jewish judges did allow for some superiority of accented speakers such as sense of humor, entertainingness, and kindness, whereas Gentile judges did not perceive accented guises more favorable on any trait.

c. In ratings of their own voices, Jewish judges rated themselves as more favorable on all traits except religiousness. The more favorable self-images of Jewish judges reflects positive stereotypes as opposed to negative self-images found among French Canadians in a previous study.[1]

d. Since there was no relation between differential ratings of guises and any personal or attitudinal variable towards Jews (scales: F-scale, anomic, anti-semitism), the authors claim that this technique taps stereotypes rather than attitudes (that is, not emotional or affective reactions).

1. Lambert, W., Frankel, H., and Tucker, G.R., "Judging Personality through Speech: A French Canadian Example," Journal of Communications, 1966, 4, 305-321.

2. BRYDEN: "on Acoustic and Social Dialect Analysis of Perceptual Variables in Listener Identification and Rating of Negro Speakers."

A. Purpose: To specify variables (acoustic, social, and personal) that function in racial identification and speech quality rating of Negro and White speakers by the same Negro and White listeners.

B. Speakers: 43 Blacks and 43 Whites representing SES distribution in SE US.

C. Judges: 43 Blacks and 43 Whites (same as speakers) chosen to provide a sample of approximate representation of distribution of SES in SE US (Charlottesville, N.C.). Since listeners and speakers were the same, there was background data on judges (personal, social, acoustic). Also there were rigid criteria for judges (specified age, sex, equal number of each race, SES, normal hearing, speech production, reading abilities, linguistic background, limited training in speech).

D. Stim Materials: Standard reading passage recorded by all speakers (who later served as judges).

E. Measure: While judges were only asked to identify race and overall speech proficiency of the recorded reading passage as well as complete a self-rating of speech proficiency, Bryden had background information including actual race, sex, and SES.

F. Factors of Speech Studied: (global and specific) acoustic, social, and personal variables in listener identification and rating. Bryden used a spectrograph to indicate perceptual variables in information-processing. Hence, he looked at physical properties of sound as well as vocal quality or quality of listener perception.

G. Findings:
a. Speakers were correctly identified as to race 95% of the time. Hence the number of phonetic distortions is significant **in predicting listener identification of race of speakers from recorded speech samples.**

b. Socioeconomic status score and articulatory product score (a semi-objective index of speech proficiency) were significant factors in predicting speech quality ratings in this sample.

c. No significant intergroup differences were found in the comparison carried out on acoustic variables from spectrographic displays (the spectrographic analysis is performed on speech samples of 10 Negro and 10 White males whose ethnicity had been correctly identified by the judges). Negro speakers did have consistently lower relative formant frequencies and greater attenuation of format amplitudes of [u] vowel than White speakers.

3. BUCK: "The Effects of Negro and White Dialectal Variations upon the Attitudes of College Students."

A. Purposes: To measure the evaluative reactions to dialectal variations in Negro and White speakers by employing the semantic differential and to determine whether dialectal or phonetic variations affect the competence and trustworthiness dimensions of speakers' credibility.

B. Speakers: There were four speakers representative of standard New York White and Negro dialects and of substandard White [New Yorkese] and Negro dialects. Five speech teachers later judged the tapes and got unanimous inter-rater agreement on race and standard-nonstandardness of speakers.

C. Judges: Two groups of female college students, American born and reared, enrolled in introductory voice and diction courses.

D. Stim Materials: Each speaker read a 3-minute reading passage from Alice in Wonderland and the tapes were subsequently played to judges.

E. Measures: Semantic differential on articulation, credibility scales (competence and trustworthiness) and 'skin color."

F. Factors of Speech Studied: (global and specific) Buck was interested in reactions to phonetic or dialectal variations and if such variations affect competence and trustworthiness dimensions of speakers' credibility. It was specific in pointing out the phonetic variations in NY standard, Substandard NY (NYese-Whites), and substandard (Negro) speech. However, analysis of reactions is based on global dialect differences.

G. Findings:
a. One group of judges rated affective reactions to the concept 'articulation' on the Semantic Differential; another group rated speaker on credibility scales (competence and trustworthiness). The latter group was also asked to identify 'skin color." Attitudes towards Standard Dialect (SD) of Whites and Blacks were more favorable than towards nonstandard speakers(NSD), and SD speakers were also judged more competent. Use of SD was associated with being White (24 out of 26 thought that the Negro SD was White). Hence, students were insensitive to dialectal differences that occurred between SD White and Black. They were more concerned with phonic features used to delineate standardness from nonstandardness.

b. Judges preferred NSD Black to NSD White, but there was no difference in competence judgments or trustworthiness.

c. Her conclusion that "Regardless of color, speakers using SD were considered more competent than those using NSD" is questionable since those using SD were often judged as being White (see a).

4ABC ELLIS: "Speech and social status in America."

A. Purposes: To disprove the statement that speech differences between classes are subtle and inconsequential; to prove that a person's social status is revealed by his voice (even content-free speech); and to try to isolate various speech qualities which reveal status and investigate abilities of speakers to disguise such qualities.

B. Speakers: 12 speakers were college freshmen whose SES was determined by educational and occupational background of their fathers. Different dialects: General American, Indiana Twang, New York, rural South.

C. Judges: students at Purdue University.

D. Stim Materials:
A: Speakers retold a fable paralleling Putnam and O'Hern's study.

B: Speakers were told to fake good grammar and voice quality as if upper class, while pretending to conduct a tour around a college dormitory.

C: Counting 1-20.

E. Measure: A, B, C: judges guessed SES of speakers; this was correlated with objective measures of SES (Hollingshead Index). In A & C likableness of speaker was also rated. In C, a job-type rating scale was completed.

F. Factors of Speech Studied:
A: No specific factors isolated in speakers' retelling of fable.

B: Analysis showed use of proper grammar by all speakers, but great variety in dialect groups existed in choice of vocabulary, sentence length, sentence structure, and fluency.

C: Designed to more rigidly control the speech variables heard by the listeners. Eliminates above variables (B) by having speakers count 1-20 at set rate of speed.

G: Findings:
Study A: Regional dialects of speakers do not inhibit the ability of listeners to identify speakers' social status (correlation .80).

Study B: Even having speakers fake good grammar and upper class speech, subjective social status ratings correlated .65 with objective ratings. Analysis of speech showed speakers used proper grammar but choice of vocabulary, sentence length, sentence structure, and fluency varied greatly, and could thus serve as possible cues for SES identification.

Study C: Speakers counted 1-20 and after 20 seconds of speech there was still a .65 correlation between subjective and objective ratings. This suggests that cues may be in the pronunciation of words or in some tonal qualities of voices.

D. In A & C, listeners rated likableness of speakers, which correlated with objective SES, .76, and subjective SES, .60. Also when rating "job best suited for" (C) with objective SES, the correlation was .67, implying that in this situation, judges identified general level of employment which corresponded to social status of the person. In short, HOW ONE SPEAKS REVEALS HIS SOCIAL CLASS.

5. FELSENTHAL: "Racial Identification as a Variable in Mediated Instruction."

A. Purpose: To measure retention and attitude formation of students based on identification with the racial group of the speaker as a reference group.

B. Speakers: A narrator using standard or General American dialect with accompanying picture of a Caucasian, and then another version had same speaker using the "Negro Dialect" accompanied by a picture of a Black man.

C. Judges: 256 eighth graders, 40% Black.

D. Stim. materials: 140 minute instructional sound-slide presentation about the African Bushman.

E. Measure: Retention of information of speaker, attitude toward content of narration, source credibility, and racial identification with appropriate reference group.

F. Factors of Speech Studied: (global) He used two speaker dialects -- standard or General American and Negro Dialect. But Felsenthal does not clarify what speech factors distinguish the two dialects he has selected. He used the same person for both audio narrations to eliminate personality variables which would have been confounded with ethnic voice.

G. Findings:

a. Racial identification tests showed that students clearly identified with their own race as a reference group, but this had no significant effect on interaction between race of judges and perceived race of narrator when retention, attitude towards content of narration, or source credibility were the criteria.

6. FLEMING: "Ratings of Urban Children's Reading Performance."

A. Purpose: To determine the effect of speech variation and labels assigned to urban children of differential reading ability, socio-economic background, and ethnic membership on teachers' rating of reading performance.

B. Speakers: The four children used are described in the following manner:

"One White 4th grader came from a lower-urban background...
One White came from an upper urban environment...
One Negro came from a lower-urban environment...
His counterpart came from an upper-urban background."

There was no indication of how SES was determined.

C. Judges: 36 teachers in a first-level graduate course in reading were used.

D. Stim Materials: "A 40-word standard passage of about third-grade level was read into a tape recorder by the four fourth-grade boys."

E. Measure: Teachers were asked to rate the reading performance of the children on twelve separate occasions. Ratings were done numerically as follows:

1-poor (needs much help)
2-fair
3-average
4-good
5-very good (primarily an independent reader)

F. Factors of Speech Studied: (global) Fleming's analysis of the speech samples was only on the global level. He gathered numerical ratings on the standard reading passages on several occasions. He later discussed differences in reading and speaking variables.

G. Findings: It was apparent that many teachers confused norms of speaking and reading performance variables. Children with 6th grade ability who were Black were judged to be poorer readers than a 4th grade White reader. Fleming concludes that in some way reading ability was confused with the children's dialectal differences in oral reading. Teachers failed to realize that the Black English speaker, when orally reading, may transfer the Standard English on the written page to his own dialect. This does not constitute a specific reading disability, nor indicate a lack of understanding of the passage.

7. GESS: "The effects of Information Which is Provided to Teachers Concerning Students on the Attitudes and the Behaviors of the Teachers and the Students."

A. Purpose: To determine how teachers' expectations for student performance is correlated with teacher-student interaction in a simulated classroom situation.

B. Speakers: No specific SES index was used. It was decided that because the students attended a school in an area which was predominantly lower-middle class to middle class, the students were of the same status.

C. Judges: All teachers taught in Oakland County, Michigan, in a school other than the one of the children. The criteria used to pick teachers were as follows:

female
presently teaching fifth grade
above average teaching effectiveness
three to twelve years of teaching experience
25 to 45 years of age
undergraduate degree from a public college
Caucasian

The principals of the schools in the district did the ratings so that all subjective judgments were made by them. In addition, all the teachers came from a school system similar to the one of the children with whom they worked in the experimental session (a residential district). The students, as so the teachers, were from lower-middle class to middle class backgrounds. No specific SES index was used.

D. Stim Materials: The students were chosen, as were the teachers, so that a planned fifty minute teaching session could be held. There had been no previous contact between the teachers and the students. The lesson plan was prepared ahead of time by the teacher, under supervised conditions. The evaluations, made subsequently, were a result of this fifty minute interplay between teacher and pupil.

E. Measure: While the FGESS Coding System was used in order to code the response types of the students, the STUDENT RATING SCALE was used to discover the attitudes the teachers had towards their students as a result of the experimental interaction. This scale contains ten items which are statements of skills which would contribute to the academic success of a student. The possible responses for each item ranged from much below average to much above average.

The items listed are:

organization of thought
contribution of useful information
creativeness of ideas
*development of vocabulary
*use of English grammar
knowledge of fifth grade subject matter
ability to work in small discussion groups
*ability to express self when speaking
demonstrates knowledge of events and people outside his own environment
general academic development

*It is the above survey which was used to tap the teachers' evaluations of the students' academic success. As can be seen, their judgments are not only partially based on language, but actually, often defined in terms of language.

F. Factors of Speech Studied: (global) Gess used the FGESS Coding System, which was developed by Ned Flanders. Of the twenty-nine categories, the following relate to language:

Categories	Subcategories and Explanations
Response	1. Factual -- teacher has elicited a response from student in which he is stating a fact. 2. Non-factual -- teacher has elicited a response which is a comment or opinion. 3. Refusal -- student expresses the fact that he will not respond. 4. Reading -- the student is reading from printed material.
Initiation	1. Factual -- the student is voluntarily giving a response stating a fact or summarizing facts. 2. Non-factual -- the student is voluntarily stating his own ideas, opinions, or feelings. 3. Irrelevant or Rebellious -- statement completely unrelated or showing rebellion to the situation.

These were factors of speech studied.

G. Findings:

a. The amount of time that students initiated statements during the experimental session, in which teacher and student met, was found to be statistically significant in the teachers' expectations for the pupils' academic success.

b. Students' positive self-expression and students' talk was found to be positively associated with teachers' expectations.

8. GUSKIN: "Social Perception of Language Variations: Black Dialect and Expectations of Ability."

A. Purpose: To discover what kind of evaluations future teachers will make about students as a result of listening to stories which have been read by them; to discover how one characteristic -- spoken language -- is linked to social class and racial background as part of an inferential process in identification of racial, regional, and class background and social expectations.

B. Speakers: Taped readings of same story by a Black "working class" 10-year old male and by a White "middle class" 10-year old male. There was no indication of how social class was determined.

C. Judges: 87 future White teachers enrolled in teacher preparatory course.

D. Stim Materials: Two passages were read, both from an interview "with a Black student, and , therefore,...casual in style and contained hesitancies and some features of black dialect. These passages were chosen to avoid an artificial reading style and to provide realistic content." Judgments were based on these taped readings.

E. Measure: Evaluated characteristics of speakers with adjective checklist and multiple choice questions.

Adjective pairs:

pleasant - unpleasant
understandable - mysterious
unpredictable - predictable
good - bad
dull - bright
follower - leader
inexact - accurate
fast thinker - slow thinker
motivated - unmotivated
unfair - fair
violent - gentle
advantaged - disadvantaged
quiet - noisy
ugly - beautiful
strange - familiar

F. Factors of Speech Studied: (global) materials used for study included reading passages from taped interview with a Black student. While trying to avoid "artificial reading style and give realistic content" with this method, she makes it difficult to ascertain whether judgmental decisions were based on race, speech, or SES.

G. Findings:

a. The Black speaker and his language were rated less favorably and triggered lower expectations about his ability and future academic achievement than the white speaker heard. This implies a possible difference in behavior toward students.

b. Guskin claims societal stereotypes are indirectly measured as well as attitudes. She describes the stereotyping process as a series of steps: Cues --> inferences --> stereotypes --> expectations --> confirmation or justification of behavior based on expectations.

9. HARMS: "Listener Judgments of Status Cues in Speech."

A. Purpose: To compare subjective listener judgments of speaker SES with the classification of an objective SES index; to determine (i) how credible listeners judge speakers to be, and (ii) the degree of correlation between listener judgments of speaker SES and speaker credibility.

B. Speakers: 9 male White Ohio speakers (30-50 years old), of high, middle, and low SES groups (based on education and occupation). The speakers were natives of Ohio or nearby.

C. Judges: 180 non-college residents of Columbus, Ohio, with known SES (Hollingshead); divided into high, middle, and low classes.

D. Stim. Materials: Free response to printed questions.

E. Measure: Ratings on speaker social status and speaker credibility, compared with objective SES index.

F. Factors of Speech Studied: (global) No specific speech factors studied, but questions simply learning vocabulary words as process of status dialect change. No analysis of individual speech samples.

G. Findings:

a. Used data on 4 scales (2 on status and 2 on credibility). He found cues present enable listener to recognize speaker's status (correlation with objective index scores).

b. Mean ratings of credibility significantly (.05) correlated with social status (positively correlated). Hence, one may be judged more credible if he sounds more educated (higher social status).

c. Judgments made after 10-15 seconds but judges did not know the basis of their rating -- word choice, pronunciation, voice quality, grammatical structure, etc. (especially since speech samples were free response to printed questions).

10. HARMS: "Status Cues in Speech: Extra-race and Extra-region Identification."

A. Purpose: To extend Putnam & O'Hern findings of SES identification based on speech examples across race and regional boundaries.

B. Speakers: (same as for #15, Putnam & O'Hern) 12 Washington D.C. Negro speakers of known SES (Warner index).

C. Judges: 64 college students at mid-western university, 38 male, 11 female, 15 no data. 63 White, 1 Yellow. Various levels of college education and variety of urban and rural community backgrounds.

D. Stim. Materials: Speakers retold a fable in their own words.

E. Measure: Judges were asked to guess SES and later race (latter informally). This was compared to objective SES ratings (Warner).

F. Factors of Speech Studied: (global) No detailed analysis of individual samples or identification of factors upon which judgments were made.

G. Findings:

a. Status dialect appears to be recognized across race boundaries (judges did not know speakers were Negro).

b. Listener-judges' identification of social status of a speaker was consistent with measurement of an objective social status index.

c. Listener-judges from two different regions strongly agree in identification of the same speakers (using P & O'H data).

d. Listener-judges from an urban community agree strongly with listener-judges from a rural community in identification of social status of speakers.

e. Listener-judges with three years or less of college agree strongly with listener-judges with four or more years of college in identification of social status of speakers.

11. HOLMES: "Interaction Patterns as a Source of Error in Teachers' Evaluations of Head Start Children."

A. Purpose: To relate the behavior patterns of Head Start children to the rankings given them by their teachers along the dimensions "perceived intelligence" and "perceived school readiness," and to compare the behavior patterns and ratings of those children to a sample of middle class children, and finally, a group of highly advantaged children.

B. Speakers: Groups of preschool children were used in this study. The status of the children is induced from the schools which they attended. The Head Start children were assumed to be lower class; the Y children were assumed to be middle class; the private school children were assumed to be upper class. There was no indication of ethnic origin.

C. Judges: One is given very little information about the teachers, other than the fact that they are currently working in one of three schools observed -- a Head Start Program, an Associated Y Nursery School, or an upper middle class private school.

D. Stim. Materials: The interaction patterns observed in the three classrooms were used as a basis of analysis and judgment.

E. Measure: Teachers were instructed to rate the children they observed from 1 to 7, depending on frequency of occurrence of the behaviors listed. Each child was studied for five 20 minute periods. Observations were scheduled on a random basis. Rankings were made along the dimensions of perceived intelligence and perceived school readiness. Ratings relating to language are:

a. Verbal -- if the child characteristically talks incessantly when under strain. This may be to peers, teachers, or no one in particular.
b. Mode of Child's Communication -- measures the child's verbal communication, i.e., how often the child uses language to make himself understood. A high scoring child uses known words, a low scoring child uses gestures, non-verbal sounds, or pre-verbal, nonsense sounds.
c. Intelligibility of Verbalizations -- how well the child can be understood, i.e., the vocal quality of communication. (Clearly versus difficult to understand.)
d. Richness of Verbalizations -- measures the quantity and verbal quality of the child's communication. Rich verbalizations usually have a large vocabulary and use fairly complex sentences.

F. Factors of Speech Studied: (global) Verbal activity, mode of child's communication, intelligibility of verbalizations, and richness of verbalizations were categories rated by teachers (discussed in Section E).

G. Findings:

a. It was found that behavior which was predictive of success in one group was not important or adaptive in another. Behavior which teachers found predictive of high intelligence in the Head Start children included a low incidence of aimless or non-purposive behavior. For the middle class child, predictive behavior of high perceived intelligence included openness in affective expression. For the upper class child, the teachers found that behavior did not predict their perceptions of intelligence.

b. In the area of "perceived school readiness" the Head Start child who was "more ready" was one who was more verbally expressive and receptive to his environment. Highly advantaged children who were viewed as being ready for school had good sociability ratings and could "relate" well to others. Verbal expression was also important, but not as important as it was in the case of the Head Start child.

12. HUGHES: "An Investigation of Certain Socio-Linguistic Phenomena in the Vocabulary, Pronunciation, and Grammar of Disadvantaged Pre-school Children, Their Parents, and Their Teachers in the Detroit Public Schools."

A. Purpose: To examine the relationship between certain linguistic phenomena in students' speech and its assessment by teachers.

B. Speakers: The social class of the informants was assumed to be low, because these were children in a Head Start program. 141 Negro and 15 White children were used in the analysis and a parent of each child included in the study.

C. Judges: The teachers were all part of the Head Start Project in the Detroit Public Schools. 20 of the teachers in the final interview were Negro; ten were White.

D. Stim. Materials: The speech of the children was taped as they were asked to respond to familiar objects presented to them. Similar recordings were made with parents and teachers who were asked about their knowledge of the children's games, toys, and experiences. Judgments were based on these tapes. The objects used were food, toys, games, and pictures.

E. Measures: The following two questions were proposed to the teachers involved in the study in order to get the teachers to state their opinions concerning the language problems of the children they taught:

1. What do you think are the major problems your children have with vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation?

2. What problems with vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation in the language of the parent are reflected in the problems of the children?

F. Factors of Speech Studied: (global) While vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation were supposedly under investigation, the analysis was global in attempting to identify which elements serve as markers of social class or of "being disadvantaged."

G. Findings: Teachers often mistook language differences for language problems. Certain language deletions in the speech of the children were uniformly taken as markers of social class. The teachers seemed unaware that such patterns occur in middle class speech as well. Teachers exhibited naive and superficial attitudes towards the language differences of the subjects. Types of deviation from the norm (phonological, morphological, syntactic) were not differentiated by the teachers, who were more concerned with vocabulary than with overall usage.

13. LAMBERT AND TUCKER: "White and Negro Listeners' Reactions to Various American-English Dialects."

A. Purpose: To examine listeners' reactions with an adjective checklist to readings by speakers of various dialect groups (Network, Educated White Southerner, Educated Negro Southerner, Mississippi Peer-Negro, Howard University, New York Alumni).

B. Speakers: Members of six dialect groups: speakers of Network English, college-educated White Southern speakers, college-educated Negro Southern speakers, college-educated Negro speakers from Mississippi attending Howard University, southern Negro students (Mississippi Peer) who spoke dialect similar to that used by most students at Negro college where the actual testing was done, and alumni from this college who have since lived in New York City. (first two groups all White; others all Negroes)

C. Judges: 150 male and female freshmen from a southern Negro college, 40 white male and female students from a New England university, and 68 white male and female students from a southern university.

D. Stim Materials: standard reading passage.

E. Measure: Evaluated speaker on adjective check-list, yielding favorability scores. In addition, white judges were asked to identify ethnicity after completing check-list.

F. Factors of Speech Studied: (global) Judges were asked to listen to readings and evaluate speakers with adjective check-list--supposedly only voice and style of speech are cues, since standard reading passages were used.

G. Findings:
a) All judges could differentiate the dialect groups and all judges rated Network (white) most favorable. Negro and northern White judges rated the Educated Negro Southerner next, while Southern white judges rated their own peer group second, followed by the Educated Negro Southerner.

b) White judges rated the Mississippi peer least favorable while Negro judges rated Educated White Southerner least favorable.

c) White judges could distinguish White and Negro speakers. The generalization that speakers perceived as "White" would be judged more favorably than those perceived as "Negro" is not supported.

14. NAREMORE: "Teachers' Judgments of Children's Speech: A Factor-Analytic Study of Attitudes." (Related to Williams' work.)

A. Purpose: Interested in going beyond evidence which shows that variations in social status correspond to variations in speech,[1] which in turn are correlated with variations in listeners' attitudes toward the speaker.[2] Earlier, Williams & Naremore found linguistic correlates of social status and ethnic differences which would provide the basis for differential responses. Naremore explores individual teacher differences to determine if groups of teachers could be isolated and defined according to common attitudinal responses and if such groups could be compared according to teacher characteristics, student characteristics, scale characteristics, speech characteristics, questions used in study, etc.

B. Speakers: 5th and 6th graders from taped samples of the Detroit Dialect Study. 20 each in higher and lower SES groups, 10 Black and 10 White, matched by sex.

C. Judges: 33 inner-city teachers, 21 White and 12 Negro. 9 were nuns, 3 males, 30 females. All were participants in a summer institute in speech and language.

D. Stim Materials: 40 speech samples were used, from taped recordings of children discussing with a linguistic field worker, first, the kind of games that he played and how to play them, and second, his favorite TV show.

E. Measure: Evaluated speakers on a 22-item semantic differential scale which included ethnic and SES identification. Objective SES was determined by the Hollingshead Index.

F. Factors of Speech Studied: (global and specific) used objective variables isolated by Williams in his earlier study (18) where tapes were subjected to exhaustive analysis yielding five broad areas (production phenomena, amounts of production, syntactic elaboration, functional characteristics, nonstandard characteristics) which included

1. Williams, F. & Naremore, Rita C. "On the Functional Analysis of Social Class Differences in Modes of Speech." Speech Monographs, 36, (1969), 77-102.

2. See Buck, Harms, Anisfeld studies.

18 discernible elements. Only pronunciation deviations and pausal phenomena were correlates of subjective ratings for all teacher types. Speech factors dealt with include: silent pauses, filled pauses, junctures per utterance, utterance total, clause ratio, sentence length, verb construction, introductory interjection, pronominal apposition, deviations in main verb, final [-s] or [-z] deviations, [θ] or [ð] deviations, [t] or [d] deviations, [m] deviations, [n] deviations, [ŋ] deviations.

G. Findings:

a. Both between and within Teacher Types (TT) were roughly divided along lines of race.

b. TT differed in kinds of judgments and across kinds of children and semantic differential scale ratings. She hypothesizes that Black teachers have more experience with Black and Standard English and also are more willing to recognize possible high status of a Black child -- hence, less association of race and social status.

c. Pronunciation deviations and pausal phenomena were correlates of the subjective ratings for all TT but TT differed, along lines of race, in correlations between subjective judgments and qualitative vs. quantitative variables in children's speech. On a semantic differential covering 22 areas of language, it was found that response tendencies clustered these 22 items into two overall areas: i) pronunciation-standardness, and ii) confidence-eagerness (basically related to response and pause variables). One teacher characteristic which tended to differentiate the teachers was teacher race. On the standardness-pronunciation scale more Black teachers tended to rate the students highly than did White teachers. In no case did a group of Black teachers consistently rate children of their own race above White children, although two segments of White teachers exhibited this kind of racial bias in rating White children above Black children. It was found that the White teachers tended to have high correlations between their judgments and such qualitative variables as verb constructions, whereas the predominantly Black groupings of teachers had high correlations between their judgments and such quantitative variables as total words in the message.

15. PUTNAM AND O'HERN: "The status significance of an isolated urban dialect."

A. Purpose: To test the hypothesis that speech serves as a mark of social class, for members of a culturally homogeneous Negro community in Washington, D.C.

B. Speakers: 12 Washington, D.C. Blacks of various social and educational backgrounds.

C. Judges: 55 Whites and 15 Negroes in Washington, D.C. 21 men, 49 women. 54 were graduate students, and 16 were teachers.

D. Stim. Materials: Speakers retold a fable.

E. Measure: Only SES, which was compared to objective measure of SES (Warner Index).

F. Factors of Speech Studied: (global) Tapes weren't standardized and only segmental phonemes were treated in detail. However, lack of standardization was used to avoid ratings based on reading facility and word selection but in wanting to minimize differences due to distinctive features of grammar and vocabulary, there is confounding due to literary sophistication, verbal facility, vocabulary. There is no information on the factors which influenced judges, such as phonetic speech features or confounding variables, intelligence, social class, etc.

G. Findings:

a. Judges produced mean ratings of the speakers' social status which correlated .80 with objective Warner Index scores. This indicated the SES of Negroes could be identified despite the differences in dialects of the speakers.

16. SHAMO: "Psychological Correlates of Speech Characteristics of Sounding Disadvantaged: A southern Replication."

A. Purposes: to examine if Williams' findings (18) were a result of geographic location of raters or if the model could be generalized, based on a Southern replication.

B. Speakers: same as 14.

C. Judges: 54 Black and 33 white elementary teachers were used, from predominantly black schools, from predominantly white schools, and from racially balanced schools with both high and low income students (Memphis, Tenn.).

D. Stim Materials: same as 14.

E. Measure: same as 14.

F. Factors of Speech Studied: same as 14.

G. Findings:
The two-factor clustering (pronunciation-standardness and confidence-eagerness) was once again found. There appeared to be no major differences in teacher ratings dependent on geographic boundaries although Southern teachers did attach more significance to "confident-unsure" evaluation than did northern teachers. Children tended to be classified as culturally disadvantaged if verbal and grammatical patterns were nonstandard. As in studies 14 and 18, irregularities in grammar, pausing, and pronunciation were associated with low socio-economic status.

17. SHUY: "Subjective Judgments in Sociolinguistic Analysis."

A. Purpose: To call attention to language research for supplementing information obtainable through objective speech samples by collecting subjective responses to samples, to enlarge knowledge of public conceptions of social speech communities (Negro Speech); to provide insights into the nature of how standard and nonstandard varieties of English may be discussed (social markedness); and to discover a vocabulary or technique with which laymen's evaluation and attitudes toward language can be observed.

B. Speakers: 3 White and 3 Black adult males (30-55) from each social class (Upper Middle, Lower Middle, Upper Working, Lower Working) except no Whites in Lower Working.

C. Judges: 620 Detroit residents: 286 6th graders, 170 11th graders, 164 adults. 256 Negro, 364 White, 305 male and 315 female. 167 Upper Middle Class, 173 Lower Middle
C Class, 140 Upper Working Class, 140 Lower Working Class (Hollingshead Scale).

D. Stim Materials: short and long (20-30 seconds)discourses by all speakers.

E. Measure: 7 point semantic differential scale with polar adjectives. Also race identification. Hollingshead scale was used to determine SES.

F. Factors of Speech Studied: (global and specific) Interested in psychosocial and linguistic variables that influence listener in identification of race and SES. Features of speech were noted through objective analysis of tapes. He found critical occurrence of some grammatical forms but found frequency of distribution, not critical occurrence, was important. He noted stigmatized grammar and phonological features (especially in lower SES groups). Middle class was typified by absence of features (multiple negation, absence of final cluster member in monomorphemic clusters, pronominal apposition, etc.)

G. Findings:

a. Objective analysis of speech samples: After assigning a Hollingshead scale number to speakers, Shuy tabulated percentage of occurrences (actual÷potential) of some grammatical forms by social class (e.g., multiple negatives) indicating that presence/absence of forms is not as critical as frequency of distribution.

b. Also according to abjective analysis, he found when comparing race and SES with some grammatical form, the point of greatest contrast was interesting: for Negroes, Upper Middle Class and Lower Middle Class was greatest; for Whites, sharpest contrast was between Lower Middle and Upper Working Classes (e.g., pronominal apposition differences were greater between racial groups that between SES groups not divided according to race).

c. Subjective analysis indicated for Whites, there was more difference between Lower Middle and Upper Working than Upper Middle and Lower Middle.

d. For Negro judges, grammatical differences between Lower Middle and Upper Working were overlooked in favor of phonological features differentiating Upper Middle and Lower Middle. This suggests that the Negro speaker who retains phonological features indicating racial identification will be considered on same level with speaker having stigmatized grammatical and phonological features.

e. Speech of Negroes and Whites was consistently distinguished and identified. Race and age of judges made little difference in the identification process, although Black judges were better in identification of Negro speakers and the same held for White judges. SES of judges mattered little in identifying Negro speakers, and Upper Middle Class judges were slightly better than other SES groups in identifying White speakers. THEREFORE, regardless of age, race, sex, or SES of listener, Negro identification of taped speakers can be made accurately 74-86% of the time.

f. Generally, the lower the SES of speakers, the more accurately the identification of SES. Also, the lower the SES, the more accurately Negroes are identified; for Whites, the higher the SES of the speaker, the more accurate is the racial identification. Whites are much less accurate than Negroes in identification of Negro Upper Middle Class.

g. The most outstanding fact in differentiation of social dialects in Detroit is the presence of stigmatized grammatical and phonological features in speech of lower SES groups. Middle Class speech lacks such features.

h. Semantic Differential (correct-incorrect) stratified according to SES of speaker; thus, value judgments were placed on those linguistic features used to identify race and SES.

18. WILLIAMS: "Psychological Correlates of Speech Characteristics: on sounding 'disadvantaged.'"

A. Purpose: To study the types of judgements that inner city teachers made about speech and language and how these evaluations (or features) served as salient cues in the judging or stereotyping children's socioeconomic status.

B. Speakers: same as 14.

C. Judges: same as 14.

D. Stim materials: same as 14.

E. Measure: same as 14.

F. Factors of Speech Studied: same as 14.

G: Findings:
a. Teachers grossly differentiated along two independent dimensions of factors loading into judgments: confidence-eagerness and ethnicity-nonstandardness.

b. Teachers' ratings of SES correlated with these two factors, indicating that such ratings were associated with both dimensions of the judgmental model. "Sounding Disadvantaged" or lower class seemed to be associated with perceiving a child as reticent or unsure in the speech situation, but even more so with his sounding ethnic and nonstandard in his language usage.

c. For the sample, ratings of status and judgmental decisions could be reliably predicted upon basis of selected features of speech and language in samples. Among the most salient predictors were the incidence of silent pausing (inversely related to confidence-eagerness) and deviations from English such as found in pronominal apposition, main verb construction, and in the realization of selected phonemes (related to ethnicity-nonstandardness).

d. Statistically reliable judged differentiations of child's actual social status were found in the case of Negro, not White, children.

e. There was some evidence of teacher race and child race playing a role: (1) ratings of child's race was more of a central correlate of ethnicity-nonstandardness for White teachers (Tw). (2) Tw ratings of race correlated more

highly with status judgments. But these differences did not affect overall status differentiations; they did reflect differences in the BASES for such differentiations, seen by dichotomizing data on status judgment and race scales (Tw put 17 of 20 Whites in upper half of status distribution while Tn put 12 of 20 Whites there).

f. All White children (high or low SES, Tw or Tn) were rated as White. For Negro children: 9 of 20 rated in high group by Tw, but 6 of these were rated as White (high SES). 8 of the Negro children were put in the high group by Tn, and only two rated as White. Thus, there appears to be a bias in White teachers: sounding White is equated with high social status.

Section 3
SUMMARY OF SELECTED PARAMETERS

TABLE IA
(Teacher-Student Studies included: 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18)

Speaker Information
(All speakers are students)

Stim. Materials	Ethnicity of Speakers: Blacks & Whites	Blacks only	Whites only	other or unspecified	Social Class Rating: low	middle	high	Other: Sex specified*	Grade specified
Speaking in class			7	11	11	7,11	11	7 (M)	7 (5th) 11 (pre-school)
oral reading	6,8				6,8	8	6	6 (M) 8 (M)	6(2nd,4th, 5th,6th) 8(5th)
taping of spontaneous speech	12,14 16,18				12, 14	14		14(M&F) 16(M&F) 18(M&F)	12(pre-school) 14(5th,6th) 16(5th,6th) 18(5th,6th)

*sex unspecified for studies 11 & 12

TABLE IB
(studies include all except 6, 7, 11, 12)

Speaker Information

Stim. Materials	Ethnicity of Speakers: Blacks & Whites	Blacks only	Whites only	other or unspecified	Social Class Rating***: low	middle/upper	Sex of Speakers: male only	male and fem.	unspecified
Reading Stand. Passage	2,3, 5**, 8,13			1,4c≠	2, 4c, 8	2,4c,8	5,8	2,13	1,3, 4c
Retelling Story		10, 15		4a	4a, 10, 15	4a,10,15		10, 15	4a
Spontaneous Speech & Resp. to Questions	14,16, 17,18		9	4b+	4b,9, 14, 16, 17,18	4b,9,14, 16,17, 18	9,17	14, 16, 18	4b

**One speaker using standard English in one case and Negro dialect in another.
***SES unspecified for studies 1, 3, 5, 13.
+4b was conducting a tour of dorm with distinguished speech
≠4c was counting 1-20 at set rate of speed.

TABLE IIA
Information on Judges
(Teacher-student studies: 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18)
All Judges are teachers

Ethnicity

Teacher Types & Information

	Blacks and Whites	Whites only	Blacks only	other	not mentioned
future teachers		8			
social class: low					
social class: middle		7			
outer city teacher	16	7			
inner city teacher	12,14, 16,18				
sex specified		7(F)			
in teacher course	14,18				6
not mentioned					11

TABLE IIB
Information on Judges
(All studies included except 6, 7, 11, 12)

Ethnicity

Background Information Available

	Blacks and Whites	Whites only	Blacks only	other	not mentioned
social class: upper/middle	4,17	1			9
social class: lower	4,17				9
Occupation: college students	5(8th graders) 13,15	8(future teachers) 10 (1 yellow)			3,4abc
Occupation: teacher ..	14,15,16,18				

TABLE III
Factors of Speech Studied
(Studies 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18)

Speech Characteristics

Scales Used	Vocabulary	Hesitation/ pause	Pronunciation	Verbalness	Clear	Positive self*	Grammar	Quality of communication	Other
Behavior observation				11	11				
Five-point performance scale									6(reading)
15 point semantic differential							8		8(subjective reactions)
Student Rating Scale & FGESS coding	7			7		7	7	7	7(organization of ideas)
Two questions about language problems	12		12				12		
22-item semantic differential	14 16 18	14 16 18	14 16 18	14 16 18			14 16 18	14 16 18	

*relates to "ability to express oneself positively"

TABLE IV
Measures Used for Different Stim. Materials
(all studies except 6, 7, 11, 12)

Measures on Speakers/Speech

Speech Material	Rated by Author	Rated by Judges**		
	Objective SES*	Subjective SES***	Ethnicity Identification	Semantic Differential Scales, Adjective Checklist, other personal and social characteristics
Reading Passage	2≠, 4c+, 8	4c, 8	1, 2, 3, 13****	1, 2, 3, 4c, 5, 8, 13
Retelling Story	4a+, 10≠ 15≠	4a, 10, 15	10	4a
Spontaneous Response to Questions	4b+, 9+ 14+, 16+ 17+, 18+	4b, 9, 14, 16, 17, 18	14, 16, 17, 18	9, 14, 16, 17, 18

*objective SES obtained with +Hollingshead Scale,
≠Warner Index, or
≠Census Bureau

** see synopses for further explanation

*** subjective SES embedded in semantic differential for 10, 14, 16, 18

**** only for White judges

Section 4

THE RESULTS OF THE STUDIES

The results from these studies are synthesized in two main sections: one centering on the areas of ethnic identification, SES identification, speech quality, and social and personal factors (hence, all studies except 6, 7, 11, 12) and the other section focusing on teacher-student relationships (studies 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18). General results are presented by dealing with groups of variables.

PART I

A. Ethnic and Dialectal Identification

One of the most consistent findings was correct identification of racial or dialectal group of the speaker by the listener, whether the speech material was free response or recorded reading passages.

Bryden (2) found that speakers were correctly identified as to race 95% of the time, the basis being phonetic distortions in the recorded speech samples. Shuy (17) also found that speech of Negroes and Whites was distinguishable, regardless of age, race, or SES of the listener (although each race was slightly better in identifying the speakers of its own race).

Tucker and Lambert (13) found their listeners could differentiate the various dialect groups in their study; in addition, white judges could also distinguish between the White and Negro speakers (Black listeners were not asked to judge race). Buck (3) asked the group who rated credibility of speaker to guess "skin color" and her results indicate race was associated with standard-nonstandard dialect since 24 of 26 listeners thought that the Negro standard dialect speakers were White (although she argues that race was not associated with standardness judgments).

Anisfeld (1) asked judges to guess religious affiliation of the speaker and then analyzed his data according to correct/incorrect identification. This did not affect his major finding that any accented guises were devalued. Jewish judges characterized more voices as Jewish than Gentile judges, but this may have been a function of experience and of having a ready label.

Finally, it should be pointed out that several studies (Williams (18), Naremore (14), and Shamo (16)) had racial identification embedded in the semantic differential, and subsequently related this to social class (e.g., child sounds; White-like...Negro-like; the language shows a: standard-American style ...marked ethnic style.)

B. Ethnic (Dialect) Identification and Ratings of Speech Quality and Personal Factors

The emphasis of these findings was that once ethnic identification was established, it was accompanied by stereotypic attitudes of speech quality and personal characteristics.

Williams (18) found that ratings of a child's race were more of a central correlate of ethnicity-nonstandardness for White teachers. White teachers also placed more of the White speakers in the upper status group than did Negro teachers. Naremore (14) found that not only did pronunciation deviations and pausal phenomena correlate with the subjective ratings for all her Teacher Types, but the Teacher Types differed along their racial lines. Subjective judgments were more highly correlated with qualitative variables (verb constructions) for White teachers while subjective judgments were more highly correlated with quantitative variables (total words) for Black teachers. In Shamo's Southern replication (16), he found that White teachers associate being culturally disadvantaged with child's race and with measures of clause ratio and sentence length. Irregularities in grammar, silent pausing, and pronunciation are significantly related to child race and to classification as culturally disadvantaged.

Tucker and Lambert (13) were concerned with favorability ratings of various dialect groups. They found that White judges could distinguish between Black and White speakers, but support for the generalization that speakers perceived as White would be judged more favorably than those perceived as Negro was lacking. All judges rated Network speakers (who were White) as most favorable. Racial differences occurred in selection of least favorable speaker with White judges selecting the Mississippi Peer (Southern Negro students like Southern Negro judges) and Negro judges selecting the Educated White Southern group.

Buck (3) used standard and nonstandard speech samples of Whites and Negroes and found that attitudes toward standard speech were more favorable than to nonstandard speech. However, use of standard dialect was more often associated with being White. There appears to be more concern with phonic features used to delineate standard-nonstandardness and less concern with dialectal differences between White and Black standard speech. Interestingly, there was a preference for nonstandard Black to nonstandard White speech but there was no difference in judged competence or trustworthiness for standard dialect. White nonstandard speech was viewed as less trustworthy than Black nonstandard speech. There is an association between competence and race (which Buck denies) since standard dialect speakers were judged more competent than nonstandard speakers, AND since those using standard dialect were perceived as White.

Guskin (8) found that the Black speaker and his language were rated less favorably and triggered lower expectations about his ability and future academic achievement.

Anisfeld (1) found accented guises were devalued on height, good looks, and leadership, whether identified as Jewish or not. Gentile judges did not perceive the accented guises as more favorable on any trait whereas the Jewish judges allowed for superiority in sense of humor, entertainingness, and kindness. His measure of attitude variables did not relate to the differential ratings of the guises which led him to claim he was tapping stereotypes, not attitudes or affective reactions.

Felsenthal's research (5) has a somewhat different focus on student identification with appropriate racial reference group and subsequent interaction effects between race of students and perceived race of narrator. The measures were retention of information, attitude toward content of narration, and source credibility; however, reference group identification had no significant effect on the interaction of student race and perceived race of narrator and narration information.

C. Subjective and Objective Identification of SES

Although the variable "social class" is often clouded with ambiguities and questionable meaningfulness, many researchers were primarily concerned with correlations between subjective and objective measures of SES of the speakers.

Putnam and O'Hern (15), who pioneered in this area, found judges' ratings of speakers' social class correlated .80 with objective Warner Index scores. Here White judges were listening to Negro speech samples.

Harms (9) used two scales for status and also found that the cues present enabled the listener to recognize the speaker's status. Later Harms (10) replicated the Putnam and O'Hern study in the Midwest and found consistent results. In addition his results showed that Listener-judges from two different regions, from urban and rural backgrounds, and with varying degrees of college education, did agree in identification of social status of speakers. Since his subjects did not know the race of the speakers in advance, he asserts that status dialect appears to be recognized across race boundaries.

Ellis (4) did several studies corroborating and extending these findings. He found a .80 correlation between subjective and objective scores despite the different regional dialects of the speakers. He then had his speakers fake good grammar and upper class speech and still found social status ratings correlated .65. All speakers used proper grammar so possible cues seemed to be choice of vocabulary, sentence length, sentence structure and fluency. To control for these factors, Ellis then had speakers count 1-20 at a set pace. His .65 correlation between subjective and objective SES ratings was maintained.

D. SES and Speech Quality Ratings and Personal Traits

Identification of social status led to stereotypic responses regarding the speech quality or personal traits of the speaker.

Shuy (17), in finding the semantic differential stratifying according to SES of the speaker, concluded that value judgments were placed on the linguistic features used to identify SES and race.

Harms (9) found mean ratings of credibility were significantly and positively correlated with social status. Hence, the higher the social status, the more educated one sounded and the more credible he was judged. He also found that judgments were made after 10-15 seconds, but the judges did not know the bases for their judgments.

Bryden (2) also found SES to be a significant factor in predicting speech quality ratings.

Williams-Naremore-Shamo (18, 14,16) found that teachers grossly differentiated along two independent dimensions: confidence-eagerness and ethnicity-nonstandardness. Teachers' ratings of social status correlated with these two factors. Sounding "disadvantaged" or lower class was associated with perceiving a child as reticent or unsure in the speech situation and even more so with perceiving his language as ethnic or nonstandard.

Ellis (4) found that likeableness of speakers was correlated with objective and subjective SES ratings. Since a rating scale of "job best suited for" correlated with objective SES, he concluded that judges identify general level of employment from the speech samples which then corresponds to the social status of the speaker.

E. SES and Race

Williams-Naremore-Shamo (18,14,16) have done much work relating SES (particularly "culturally disadvantaged") with race. It has already been pointed out how teacher and child race differentially affect the two-factor judgments. Also, all White children, regardless of SES or teacher race, were rated as White. White teachers put 17 of 20 White children in the upper half of the status distribution while Negro teachers put 12 of 20 Whites there. White teachers put 9 of 20 Negro children in the high status group, but 6 of these were rated as White. Negro teachers put 8 of the Negro children in the high status group, and only two of these were rated as White. Thus, there seems to be a bias in White teachers in that sounding "White" is equated with high social status. The less direct association of race and social status for Black teachers is probably a function of increased experience with both Black and Standard English, making it easier to recognize high status of Black children.

Shuy (17) found the lower the SES, the more accurately Negroes were identified while the reverse was true for White speakers (the higher the SES, the more accurate the racial identification). White judges were also less accurate than Negroes in identification of Negro Upper Middle class.

F. Objective Language Analysis and Related Findings

This line of research is extremely valuable in that it reveals, through linguistic analysis of speech samples, the basis of listeners' responses and subsequent relationships with dependent measures.

Shuy (17)tabulated per cent of occurrences of some grammatical forms by social class (actual+potential) which led him to conclude that the presence/absence of forms was not as critical as the frequency of the distribution. He combined race and SES in his analysis and found the point of greatest contrast interesting: for Negroes, the sharpest contrast was between Upper Middle and Lower Middle Classes (which differ phonologically) while for Whites, the greatest difference was between Lower Middle and Upper Working Classes (which differ grammatically). Subjective reactions revealed similar difficulty in distinguishing between UM and Lm class Negroes; thus, subjective responses confirmed the objective demarcations between classes. For the Negro listeners, subjective reactions to the SES of the speaker on correct-incorrect scale indicated that UM was relatively neutral and LM and UW were viewed as somewhat incorrect. While objective data showed that UM and LM differ phonologically, and UM and LM differed from UW and LW in both phonology and grammar, subjective reactions classified LM and UW closer together than UM and LM for Negroes. Hence, because grammatical differences between LM and UQ were overlooked more than were phonological features distinguishing between UM and LM, Negro speakers (UM) who retained phonological features of LM were perceived as having both the stigmatized grammatical and phonological features of the Working Classes.

Williams (18) found status and judgmental decisions could be predicted upon the basis of selected features of speech and language. The most salient predictors were the incidence of silent pausing (inversely related to confidence-eagerness) and deviations from English such as pronominal apposition, main verb construction, selected phonemes (related to ethnicity-nonstandardness).

Shamo's study (16) yielded additional evidence that teacher judgments based on verbal and grammatical cues differed minimally between Northern and Southern teachers. Black teachers were more concerned with pronunciation whereas for White teachers there was more association with child's race and with measures of clause ratio and sentence length. The label "culturally disadvantaged" was associated with these linguistic variables. The implication was that SES is reflected in one's speech by silent pausing, nonstandard grammar, and nonstandard pronunciation.

Bryden's (2) spectrographic analysis yielded no significant intergroup differences on acoustic variables although Negro speakers did have consistently lower relative formant frequencies and greater attenuation of format amplitudes of [u] vowel than White speakers. The Articulatory-Product Score was a predictor of speech quality rating of the speakers by the listeners.

PART II

Both Guskin's and Fleming's studies used oral reading as the mode of eliciting students' language. Both involved both Black and White speakers. In Guskin's study (8), the Black speaker's language was rated less favorably on ten out of the fifteen rating scales. In Fleming's research (6), it was found that an upper-class White, reading the same passage as a lower-class Negro of nearly the same reading level rating, received substantially higher ratings for the oral reading. In both cases, it appears that socio-economic status and race were in some way indicated through language features; in both cases the Black and the lower-SES students was rated less fovorably.*

The Hughes study and the Naremore investigation both found that teachers were more interested in vocabulary, isolated words and pronunciations than they were in the overall message that was being expressed. In the Naremore study (14), it was more often the White teachers who were swayed by such isolated features as verb constructions. In the Hughes dissertation (12), both the Black and White teachers persistently commented about such features as dropping endings and sliding words together.**

A frequent feature of language taken into consideration in teacher evaluations was pronunciation. Naremore-Williams-Shamo (14,18,16) as well as Guskin (8) and Hughes (12) all found this an interacting component. In the Guskin study (8) the only difference between the two student speakers was their pronunciation patterns. Hughes (12) found that teachers often commented on the pronunciation patterns of the children with whom they worked. The semantic differential devised by Williams (18 and Naremore (14) was sensitive to a clustering of several language judgments around the measure of pronunciation-standardness. Again, non-standard English dialects suffered in the judgments made.

* Bob Frender, Harvard University, recently discovered that reading styles affect one's evaluations of students. (Doctoral dissertation, The Relationship Between Speech Style and Scholastic Success and Its Implications for Lower Social Class Children, 1970.

** The Hughes and the Naremore studies conflict in one major area. Whereas Naremore found that there was a significant difference between the responses of the Black and the White teachers in their ratings, Hughes found no such differences.

Williams, in Language and Poverty[1], cautions that to the middle-class White, the Black child may often seem reticent; however, it may be that the child is not as verbally explosive as the middle-class child tends to be. For a variety of reasons, the child of the inner city may be more succinct in his verbal communication. This, of course, does not mean he cannot think or that he is simple-minded. Nevertheless, the Williams-Naremore studies indicate that judgments concerning the confidence and eagerness of the speaker were made on the basis of pausal phenomena. They were not the only ones to discover biases towards the fluent, verbal child. Holmes (11), in observing and interviewing teachers, found that for the middle-class child, the quantity of verbal expression was an important indicator of perceived intelligence. Verbal expressiveness was also found to be predictive of school readiness for our year olds in Head Start, as well as those who were of "advantaged" backgrounds. The Gess dissertation (7) used only Caucasian teachers and students. He also discovered that teachers evaluated the students' potential for academic success higher if the students initiated more statements during class. The students who expressed themselves voluntarily, giving either fact or opinion, were the ones who were given higher expectation ratings. Their verbal spontaneity and fluency did not go without notice.

Conclusion:

In each of the studies reviewed above, some component of language and communication was associated with judgments made by teachers concerning one or more of the following:

reading ability
speaking ability
future academic success
intelligence

Those students who did not exhibit what might be called middle-class langauge habits (i.e., reliance on extensive verbal participation and the usage of Standard English), often received lower evaluations. Not surprisingly, these were the economically poor, the withdrawn, and/or the Black students.

[1] F. Williams, "Language, Attitude, and Social Change." In Language and Poverty: Perspectives on a Theme, ed. F. Williams, (Chicago: Markham Publishing Company, 1970).

Section 5

EVALUATION/CRITIQUE OF THE STUDIES

The following section is devoted to a critical analysis of the experimental research presented here. Upon examining these studies, there are questions raised about the assumptions and methodology employed in each study, as well as discussions on many shortcomings which should be avoided to make future research more lucid and definitive. In short, what cautions must the reader be aware of in evaluating these studies? In what ways are the authors discussed throughout this paper drawing conclusions which are based on insufficient evidence? In what ways have they confounded several issues, while claiming to focus on one -- that of judgments based on language?

1. ANISFELD: This study is somewhat different from most of the others presented in this section in that Anisfeld dealt with accented English (Jewish) and reactions to it. Race and SES were not critical factors for him. The charts indicate that class and sex of the speakers were not mentioned. While it does extend previous research at McGill, it does not shed much light on the basis for judgments by listeners.

2. BRYDEN: This is probably one of the best studies, methodologically speaking. By using the same speakers as judges, Bryden was assured of having much information about his speaker and listener population. In addition, he had rigid criteria for selection of subjects (normal hearing, no speech pathologies, reading ability, linguistic geographic background, amount of formal speech training) in addition to a well-balanced sample (sex, race, SES). SES was established according to Census Bureau Information, and subjects were randomly selected within SES categories which approximated the distribution of SES in SE United States (sample from Charlottesville, N.C.). This study should be commended in that spectographic analysis allows a deeper analysis of the variables that may function in listener identification of race and speech quality ratings.

3. BUCK: The author clarified the linguistic differences among the dialect groups she employed, and she clearly specified two different dialects for nonstandard speakers of different races. While judges identified race and nonstandardness-standardness, one wonders if class differences for the two races plays a role at all. Her judges were also all female and enrolled in voice and diction courses which makes them a specialized group from which it is difficult to generalize. Her conclusions also do not seem to follow her data. While she claims that "regardless of color, speakers using standard dialect were considered more competent than those using nonstandard dialect", the data indicate that 24 of 26 judges thought that the Negro standard dialect speakers were White. Hence, if the speaker was perceived as White and then judged more competent, then one cannot claim that race was not a factor in judging competence.

4. ELLIS: The studies cited here are described by Ellis, but were never published as journal articles. Thus, there is limited information about each study, especially regarding the listener and speaker populations. In an attempt to isolate the factors underlying judgments about SES, Ellis should be commended in finding a simple experiment -- counting from one to twenty -- and still getting a high correlation with objective measures of SES. He concludes that cues must lie in pronunciation of words or in some tonal qualities of speakers' voices. Had he submitted his data to spectographic analysis, this conclusion might have been verified. From his report one does not know much about the variability of SES among his dialect groups and how this affected listener judgments. (e.g., All those with the Indiana twang may well have been of a lower SES and thus judgments may have been more a function of stereotypic responses to the dialect itself rather than differences within a dialect group along a continuum of SES categories.)

5. FELSENTHAL: This study is somewhat different from the others in that he was measuring retention of information, attitude toward content of narration and source credibility based on identification with appropriate racial reference group. He used the same speaker who used standard or General American dialect when a picture of a Caucasian was associated with the film and used "Negro Dialect" when a Black picture accompanied the film. It is not clear how different these two speech samples were -- pronunciation and tone alone or did syntax differ as well? His hypotheses wer e not confirmed, and he criticizes his own methodology in that he presented the stimulus and measurement instruments rather than the teacher and his stimulus material was topic-bound rather than neutral. His primary interest is in the effects of racial identification with a reference group rather than attitudes based simply on language differences, and hence, may be less appropriate to this entire discussion.

6. FLEMING: Only four students comprised Fleming's speaker sample, and determination of SES of speakers was not explicit. Thus, it seems that his results are confounding SES, ethnicity, and grade level, since these factors were not examined in isolation. The race of the listener (teacher) is also not mentioned. As seen in other studies, teacher race may have an effect on results obtained.

7. GESS: One way to quickly scan the detail with which the various researchers have handled their problem is to glance at the tables included in this paper. Those authors who are listed under only one or two of the headings failed to consider the other factors available. By not controlling for these factors they have put the results of their work in jeopardy. Until all factors have been considered, it is difficult to know what factor correlates with what consequence. Gess chose to deal with a limited sample, Caucasian, middle-class teachers as well as Caucasian, middle-class students. Nevertheless, within his chosen framework he is quite thorough. Yet there are several areas in which questions must be raised. The experimental sessions, during which the teachers made their evaluations of the students, were videotaped. What effect did the two cameramen and their equipment have on the teacher and the way in which she made judgments? As the teachers were confronted only with their voices on tape, what effect did the physical appearance of the children have on the teachers? How did this factor enter into judgments made? Weren't their attitudes molded by visual as well as auditory cues? How can the two be separated out? These are questions which must be answered before coming to any conclusions about the results of Gess' study.

8. GUSKIN: The speaker samples used in this study (a Black lower class male vs. a White middle class male) allow interpretation of the results to be hindered by the inability to sort out what effects are due to race and what is a function of class. Although the author wished to avoid an artificial reading style and give the sample realistic content, her method does not solve this problem. While speakers read a passage lifted from a transcript of an interview with a Black person, the fact that it was a reading passage excludes it from being "spoken language" which she says she is examining.

The question that Guskin leads one to ask is whether teachers of reading can distinguish adequately among reading mistakes, pronunciation differences, and spelling miscues. The reading skill involves processes often very different from that of speaking. It was assumed in this study that because the passages which the students were to read were identical, the only differences between the two readings would be phonological. Can this conclusion be drawn? What about the differences in intonation, competency in oral reading, and affective expressions? How did these enter into the readings of the two students, and what effects did they have?

Once again, it seems that social class and language differences were confounded in the results of this study. A Black "working class" boy and a White middle class boy were used. The Black speaker was correctly identified as to race and social status by the judges. He also received lower ratings. Was that because of language cues that indicated race, social status, deviance from the speaking standards of the judges, or any combination of the above? A lack of specificity is evident here. Also, the use of only White judges limits the findings of this study.

9. HARMS: This study involved a small sample (nine) of White Ohio male speakers. He was only concerned with global speech factors (free response to printed questions) and to that extent his conclusions are limited in their generalizability. While speaker status could be judged accurately along with credibility correlates, the basis for such judgments was not ascertainable from this study. While Harms questions learning vocabulary words as a process of status dialect change, his work does not demonstrate that this is the or a crucial variable. He also determined class by using the Hollingshead scale. (see 14)

10. HARMS: This study was undertaken to extend the conclusions of the work of Putnam and O'Hern (15) by using a Midwestern sample of listeners. While the tapes were of Negroes from Washington, D.C., the judges were White (one Yellow), all of whom were enrolled in speech courses at a Midwestern university. Their educational level and childhood communities differed, but the fact that they were enrolled in speech courses makes the sample somewhat hypersensitive to the experiment, and the findings less generalizable. However, the importance of replication is revealed here as the results of the Putnam and O'Hern study were confirmed and since Harms' subjects did not know the race of the speakers, it can be said that status dialect was recognized across race boundaries.

11. HOLMES: Just as there is something to be said for the consideration of race and social status in studies searching for those factors which mold attitudes, so too is there something to be said for the consideration of sexual differences. In what way does a male teacher relate differently to a male student than he would a female? In what way does a male student relate differently to a female teacher than he would to a male? The Holmes study dealt with many children of various upbringings. It failed, however, to consider the sexes of the children and the teachers under discussion. Sex types are, of course, very directly related in language, where the difference in pitch and tone between the sexes is audible. One cannot afford to ignore sex type.

Many concepts are considered in the Holmes study which have been inadequately defined. For instance, on what does one base the school readiness of a child? Does not such a decision depend very much on the type of school the child is getting "ready" for? Not to beg the question, standardized measures are not standardized to the situations of all children. What biases do they have? For example, isn't the Stanford-Binet weighted towards the "more verbal" child? Particularly because Holmes worked with lower class, middle class, and upper class children, it seems vital that he should have sensitized himself to culturally clothed terminology and testing.

12. HUGHES: In the teacher-student studies, only the Gess dissertation formally considered the socio-economic status of the judges. The Hughes dissertation, among others, does not deal with the problem of how a listener's SES will affect how he relates to what he hears. If

it is true that middle class people are more verbally "explosive", then do more verbal people tend to favor verbal people? Are many of the distinctions we make in listening to speech based on social class differences? If so, then are we judging one's language or the social class standing which we may infer from that language? Those researchers who do not take into consideration social class influences neglect, perhaps, an important aspect of the attitudinal response. The teachers which Hughes used were informed that the tapes they were to hear were of Head Start preschoolers. One must ask in what way this information predisposed them to make certain decisions, even before they listened to the tapes of speech. It is interesting to note that the teachers questioned by Hughes unanimously saw the children's language "problems" as related to their social status. They also unanimously agreed that the children's language was different from their own. It seems obvious that class differences and biases are involved in these statements. There needs to be a systematic way to measure these tendencies, to factor them out.

13. LAMBERT and TUCKER: They used a limited number of speakers from several dialect groups. Social class was not a variable in this study. Their selection of White judges from different parts of the country allowed them to make interesting observations regarding least favorable dialect group. However, the use of only an adjective check-list did not allow them to explore the basis of favorability judgments although they claim only voice and style of speech are cues. Although race of speakers was not a variable, the most favored group were the Network speakers, all of whom were White. Expansion of the speech factors studied and the possible variety (race and class) of speakers may help to extend their findings.

14. NAREMORE: The line of research carried out by Williams, Naremore, and Shamo is quite thorough and sound methodologically. The chief criticism that can be made is that the sample of judges consisted of 33 inner-city teachers, 21 White and 12 Negro. There were also only three males in this sample. Although Naremore says, "to the extent that sampling is not exhaustive, generalizations of the results of the study are limited", generalizations are also limited because the sample was a group involved in a summer institute in speech and language. One would expect this group to be hypersensitive to language differences, particularly involving race and SES groups.

The whole meaning of class is also worth examining, as Williams mentions in Language and Poverty. While the Hollingshead scale takes education, occupation, and residence factors into account, "social class" is a questionable variable and very relative to the community involved. The Hollingshead is an old measure based on a community very different from Detroit or Chicago. To date there appears to be no measure of SES which behaves similarly across different ethnic groups.

The thoroughness of the Williams-Naremore work has much to commend it. Objective variables in the speech samples were isolated in another study, which gave them valuable information regarding the

basis for judgments on the semantic differential they also developed. The speakers were balanced for SES and race as well. Their work is a good example of how free response information can be used, and yet thorough analysis of the speech samples still allows one to gain insight into the cues available to the listener.

15. PUTNAM and O'HERN: This study can be called the Grandfather of them all, as it appeared to kick off the interest in speech serving as a sign of social status. While they analyzed the phonetic features of a low social status group, this was not used in ascertaining the basis for social status judgments. It should be pointed out that they wanted ratings of speech in the absence of such irrelevant cues (visual, etc.) and also felt that restriction to a standard reading passage would reflect the educational background of their subjects (reading facility) and would also have eliminated distinctive features of grammar and vocabulary of a particular dialect group. Hence, they chose to have speakers retell a fable. This method is subject to criticism because besides vocabulary and grammar, some level of literary sophistication is required to reconstruct the story. The use of only Negro speakers is defended by the authors on the grounds that stereotypic traits may be assigned to Negro speakers, but it is unknown if speech differences between Whites and Negroes of comparable class status exist. For this reason social status is conceived of as a position on the prestige continuum rather than membership in a particular social class. (The Warner Index was used which includes occupation, source of income, house type, and dwelling area.)

16. SHAMO: This study was a southern replication of the Williams' work. The criticisms directed at the speaker sample (particularly with reference to the variable, social class) hold for this study as well. However, the fact that the studies produced similar results with a different group of judges strengthens the findings of Williams and Naremore, particularly because Shamo's study is not subject to the biasing influences of the sample of judges used by Williams and Naremore.

17. SHUY: This study included the largest sample of judges (620), including different ages, Whites and Blacks, different SES groups, and both sexes. His study consisted of critical, objective analysis of the tapes and judges' responses to them, including a semantic differential scale and racial identification. Shuy's results shed light on the use of class as a difficult variable -- he had no Whites in the lower working class and he also analyzed his tapes according to class but separately for Whites and Blacks. The point of greatest contrast between socioeconomic classes for both subjective and objective data differed for the two races.

18. WILLIAMS: see 14 and 16.

Section 6

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS (A)

What can be made of all these studies? What ideas are interwoven throughout the works of the researchers mentioned, and how can the teacher gain from their findings? First, the caution must be made that generalizations cannot be easily made, especially with reference to all students. All these studies analyzed dealt with only White and/or Black students. There is some much needed research to be done with Indian children, Puerto Rican children, and other bilingual groups living in the United States. The effects of their language differences are equally important in analyzing teacher-student communication and attitudes.

To summarize, the following trends were found in teacher attitudes towards the language of their students:

1. The language of the student was often thought to be inferior or, in some way, incomplete when the language of the student was different from that of the teacher. (Naremore, Shamo, Fleming)

2. Children who initiated the most statements in class were rated higher by the teachers surveyed in terms of expectations for future academic success, as well as of intelligence. (Gess, Holmes)

3. Those students who appeared to be more confident in their speech were predicted to do better on school achievement. (Gess)

4. The language performance of the child was directly associated with the adequacy of his thought processes. (Hughes)

5. The dialect form of Black English was seen as a deficient language form, which lacks an organizational structure. (Hughes)

6. Speech was often associated with a wide variety of personality characteristics of the speaker, self-confidence being one example. (Naremore, Williams, Shamo)

7. Predictions about the future academic success of students was based on their oral reading. In the cases where the reading text was in Standard English, those readers who spoke a non-standard dialect of English suffered in the evaluation. (Guskin, Fleming)

A teacher makes judgments about children precisely because he has been given the job to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of his students. One cannot underestimate the importance of having a firm foundation upon which to base these judgments. In the studies presented above there were four main areas of confusion which may have resulted in weak bases for judgments:

(1) Quantity rather than quality of words uttered -- The distinction which must be made between the two is that the one does not imply the other.

(2) Pausal phenomenon -- The silence of a pause in speech is like the empty space between letters and words in writing. The latter is certainly not frowned upon, so why should the former be?

(3) Oral reading -- There is a vast difference between the tasks involved in oral reading and those involved in silent reading. How much different, then, must oral reading be from speech fluency and one's ability to communicate through spontaneous speech? One's oral reading should not be treated as indicative of his speech or silent reading ability.

(4) Grammar, Pronunciation, and Lexicon -- These three are highly interrelated in the overall structure of language, and, as such, deviance in any one is often confused with weakness in another of the three language components. Within the English language a tremendous degree of variability among these three is found in any speaker. Certain distinctions made by the "lower-class" speaker are also made at times by the "middle-class" speaker and vice versa. Codes, styles, phonology, morphology, and syntactical features used in speaking vary on the basis of the context the speaker finds himself within.[1]

In light of the emphasis made on certain areas of language in the research noted above, perhaps all those interested in language and the classroom could benefit from more information on the written and spoken word in English. One comes to know the child through his language, yet language itself can be a tool of deception. To counteract this tendency, it is recommended that material be provided to aid the teacher's knowledge of language. Ultimately, this knowledge can help him to understand his students. And so, both student and teacher are done a service. Suggested areas of study are:

1. Hymes, D., V. John, C. Cazden, Functions of Language in the Classroom, Chapter Seven, not yet released for publication.

1. The differences and similarities between the various language styles and dialects of the English language -- the many standards of "Standard English".

2. The differences between language and thought -- the ways in which one does not necessarily correlate with the other.

3. Those factors involved in oral reading as opposed to those involved in speech.

As a teacher it is all too easy to say, "I understand that child." After reviewing the studies on language attitudes of teachers, one might want to ask, "Do you really understand?"

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS (B)

The basic premise underlying these studies is that variation in speech patterns reflects variations in ethnicity and in socio-economic status groups which, in turn, are associated with stereotypic attitudes regarding a speaker's personal traits and abilities. While researchers have attempted to explain and document this premise in many ways, the reader should carefully note the shortcomings of many of the works presented here and perhaps the areas where future effort should be applied.

The speaker samples for these studies also included only White and/or Black subjects. One question to be asked is whether one can generalize from these samples to all other ethnic minority groups stratified in our society (such as Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, or Indians). If not, how do the bilingual problems of these groups differ from those of Black Americans, and are stereotypic attitudes of these groups and toward them different from Black Americans? Simply stated, more research dealing with other bilingual groups is needed.

The question of stimulus materials is a difficult one since standardized reading passages probably do not accurately reflect speech styles or spoken language, yet using free response speech samples introduces many other linguistic and extra-linguistic cues which must either be controlled or accounted for in the analysis of data. The latter alternative is being used by more researchers now and is thus shedding light on the differences in speech samples as well as on the basis of judgmental decisions by listeners.

Many studies did not use well-balanced groups (in terms of sex, SES, or race) as judges and to that extent, many of the findings are severely limited. Using a group of university students or teachers enrolled in speech courses biases the results of the studies as one would expect hypersensitivity of these listeners to variations in language patterns as well as many years of formal training in using "Standard English".

The use of "social class" is also questionable for many reasons. While sociologists are still struggling with the definition of this complex variable and proper measurement of it, linguists are readily labelling their speakers or listeners according to old measures, many of which have been discarded by sociologists. There seems to be no measure of SES which behaves similarly across different ethnic groups.[1] One who deals with the social class variable must also entertain the question of what social class really means. Does one mean to imply that groups of people who have similar educational backgrounds, occupations, and incomes share a similar culture with similar speech

1. Light, R.J. and P.V. Smith, Choosing a Future: Strategies for Designing and Implementing New Programs. Harvard Educational Review 40, Feb. 1970, p. 488.

and language styles? What is the basis for assuming such "similar classes" share linguistic features or speech patterns, particularly across different ethnic and/or regional groups?

The research indicated that both ethnicity (or dialectal) groups and SES groups can be identified based on a variety of speech samples. The basis for such judgments ranges from pronunciation deviations and grammatical form to pausal phenomena. Having established that such identification is possible, researchers have collected correlates of this identification process which seem to reflect stereotypes of certain ethnic groups and/or status groups (by listeners). One line of research has yielded data establishing differences in White and Black judges in ascribing status, credibility, and favorability ratings to Black and White speakers as well as ascribing values of confidence-eagerness and ethnicity-nonstandardness (and subsequently, classification as culturally "disadvantaged") to different ethnic and SES groups. Besides "sounding White" being associated with higher SES, it was also found that for Whites, the higher the SES, the more accurate the racial identification whereas for Negroes, the lower the SES, the more accurate the identification. This, of course, may be associated with the unequal employment opportunities in this country accounting for the increased accuracy in judgments.

The other line of research stemming from identification based on speech cues is exploration of the actual linguistic cues which are present in speech samples from different ethnic groups and/or different SES groups. Labov[1] pioneered in this area as he attempted to isolate the speech variants in different SES groups. Bryden's work (2), including speech proficiency and spectographic analyses, is important in searching for the basis of listeners' judgments of speakers' race.

Pulling these lines of research together -- the evaluative process and the linguistic analysis -- are the studies by Williams (18), Naremore (14), Shamo (16), and Shuy (17). Their concern is to understand not only the linguistic variants in free response speech, but also the stereotypic responses which accompany identification of SES and/or ethnicity based on these linguistic variants. Understanding and elucidating these factors and attitudes, however, is only a first step. The linguist interested in practical applications of research and the teacher interested in making use of such information is likely to ask what the implications of this research are.

IMPLICATIONS: Establishing identification of ethnicity and SES and subsequent attitudinal correlates leads one to recognize that stereotypes based on language differences exist in this country. Since these stereotypes often reflect negative values and not objective reality of particular groups, especially minority groups, one may ask what should be done

1. Labov, William. The Social Stratification of English in New York City. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics (1966).

to break this stereotyping process. There are two alternatives: One may elect to teach everyone "Standard English" in the hopes that eventually all linguistic variants among individuals will be diminished or one may accept the linguistic variants that exist and try to increase understanding and tolerance among the population for linguistic differences, thereby reducing the negative values associated with different ethnic and/or SES groups' speech patterns. The former method seems to be one which has been practiced in school systems for years along with the denial of syntactic structure and well-formed grammatical rules of dialects other than "Standard English". These studies are testimony to the failure of schools to obliterate speech differences in various groups. To proceed along this course seems to obscure the more important issue: possession of a language style different from "Standard English" is often associated with negative values and traits which may have no grounding in objective reality. There needs to be an opening of communication channels between the population-at-large and professional linguists so that information from studies such as these can be disseminated in an attempt to eradicate this widespread negative stereotyping and intolerance for differences. Only by making information widely available can the knowledge about the similarities and differences between language groups be appropriately used.

To begin such a tremendous and needed undertaking, the linguists will probably turn to teachers as an important group in increasing the understanding of the role of language in evaluating individuals and in altering the stereotypic attitudes associated with language differences. Williams[2] has been actively involved in working with teacher groups to help them recognize language differences among different ethnic groups and stereotypic attitudes resulting therefrom. Such awareness is a preliminary step in dispelling the negative stereotypes which exist, because teachers play a vital role in teaching language arts and in the subsequent formation of attitudes regarding language differences. Such a unification of efforts will hopefully not only improve teacher-student communication and understanding, but also will gradually affect the population outside of the classroom who tend to assign negative values or traits to those whose language differs from "Standard English".

2. Williams, F. and E. Rundell, Teaching Teachers to Comprehend Negro Nonstandard English, Speech Teacher (in press, 1971).